

DESCRIPTION OF SCENARIOS

INTRODUCTION

In addition to preparing information on Base Year 2000 conditions, staff evaluated seven future land use scenarios for this report. The following information briefly describes key characteristics of each land use scenario. Regional land use maps for the seven future land use scenarios follow this description. Because the unincorporated County contains large tracts of public land or Tribal Lands, each scenario only addresses land use on private land.

1. **Base Year 2000:** Land uses that existed in the year 2000 were used to develop a baseline analysis. In Base Year 2000, the most developed areas of the County are located in East County Communities such as Lakeside, Spring Valley and Valle de Oro. The populations of some North County communities, such as North County Metro, Ramona and Fallbrook, are also significant.
2. **Existing General Plan:** When fully developed, this plan locates 60 percent of the total future population inside the CWA boundary and 40 percent outside that boundary. It relies heavily on large-lot development to house the County's future population, and it does not develop town centers in many communities slated for future growth. If this plan's capacity were realized, few communities inside the CWA boundary would retain their existing agriculture or open space in the year 2020. In addition, open space patterns in Backcountry communities would be dependent upon public lands, and large rural villages like Borrego Springs would be retained.
3. **December 2002 Working Copy Map:** When fully developed, this plan locates 80 percent of the total future population inside the CWA boundary and 20 percent outside that boundary. It reduces overall growth by about 100,000 persons when compared to the Existing General Plan. It also reduces the dependence on large-lot development to house the County's future population, and instead relies more heavily on medium to high-density residential areas located in new or revitalized town centers. Much of the future growth is located in North County communities. Because more growth is located in compact town centers, this plan helps to retain agriculture, sensitive habitats, and rural character throughout the unincorporated County.
4. **August 2003 Working Copy Map:** This plan is similar to the December 2002 Working Copy map, with modifications made after evaluating individual property referrals. Higher densities were applied to the southern portion of Twin Oaks and to an agricultural area in Borrego Springs. Densities were reduced throughout Julian outside its town center. Property owner referrals that were consistent with the character of the site, with surrounding development patterns, and with GP2020 objectives were incorporated into the August 2003 map. Densities were retained in remote Backcountry communities, in the County's most productive agricultural areas, and on highly constrained land.
5. **Board Referrals Scenario:** The Board Referrals scenario forms the basis for scenarios 6 through 8. Derived from the Board's motion on October 1, 2003¹, it substitutes landowner

¹ See "Previous Relevant Board Actions" for a description of the specific referrals identified by Supervisors Jacob and Horn.

requests (in some cases Planning Commission or Planning/Sponsor Group recommendations) for staff recommendations on 39 property referrals in District 2 and 27 property referrals in District 5. It also applies existing general plan densities for 32 pipelined² projects in District 5. These actions produced higher densities in the following locations:

- *North County communities:* The Board referrals and pipelined projects are widely dispersed but primarily located within the CWA boundary. Small clusters are located in Elfin Forest (San Dieguito), Twin Oaks (North County Metro), and Valley Center.
 - *East County communities:* Board referrals are primarily located in Lakeside, Crest/Dehesa/Harbison Canyon/Granite Hills, and western Alpine with scattered locations in other East County communities. Most are located within the CWA boundary.
 - *Backcountry communities:* Although referrals are widely dispersed throughout backcountry communities, most are located within the Mountain Empire subregion and Borrego Springs.
6. ***Board Referrals Scenario with Pipelined Projects:*** Based on the Board Referrals scenario, this map applies existing general plan densities to 35 pipelined projects in District 2 and one project in District 5 (Twin Oaks). In District 2, most of these projects are located in Ramona, but others are dispersed throughout Backcountry communities.
 7. ***Board Referrals Scenario without 80s & 160s:*** Based on the Board Referrals scenario, this map changes all land with densities of 1 du/80 or 160 acres to 1 du/40 acres, and it effectively establishes 1 du/40 acres as the lowest density in the unincorporated County. The affected lands include approximately 270,000 acres of private land located outside the CWA boundary and outside rural Backcountry villages.
 8. ***Board Referrals Scenario Pre-FCI:*** Based on the Board Referrals scenario, this map changes densities on land altered by the Forest Conservation Initiative (FCI) to their pre-FCI land use designations. In all cases, density is increased on FCI-affected lands. Voters passed FCI in 1993, and it established a 40-acre minimum parcel size on approximately 73,500 acres of privately owned land within the Cleveland National Forest until December 31, 2010. Most FCI-affected land is located in Backcountry communities, although FCI also affected land in Alpine and eastern Jamul.

For more information on the planning rationale used to prepare the GP2020 Working Copy maps, see staff reports submitted for GP2020 Board hearings on May 21, 2003 (December 2002 Working Copy map) and September 24, 2003 (August 2003 Working Copy map). Board Referrals Scenarios are based on the October 1, 2003 (4) Board motion. Additional information on the Board Referrals is located in Attachment B, which illustrates the location of all Board Referrals (Scenarios 5 through 8).

² Pipelined projects are TM, TPM, Specific Plan and PAA applications “deemed complete” by August 6, 2003. On August 6, 2003 the Board passed a motion that pipelined projects will be approved or denied based on Existing General Plan regulations.